

Appl. No. 10/765,752
Amdt. Dated September 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 28, 2005

Drawing Amendment:

Applicants respectfully request the amendment of Figures 1 and 2 to include the designation of "Prior Art" as required by MPEP §608.02(g) because only that which is old is illustrated. Attached are the drawings at issue with changes in red ink and replacement sheets with changes in black and white.

Appl. No.10/765,752
Amdt. Dated September 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 28, 2005

REMARKS

Applicants thank Examiner for acknowledging receipt of foreign priority document, Japanese Application No. JP2003-020719, that has been submitted pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 119 and/or PCT Rule 17.2(a).

Applicants have amended the attached drawings for Figures 1 and 2 to include the designation of "Prior Art" as required by MPEP §608.02(g).

Claims 10 - 11 have been added in order to claim further subject matter as disclosed in the specification.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3 and 4. Applicants submit that these claims remain in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5 - 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Examiner has rejected these claims in view of the cited prior art reference of *McMahon et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,421,384). The *McMahon* reference is directed to a fiber optic acoustic transducer for converting small displacement into light intensity variations. (See the Abstract of the Invention). Despite the Examiner's assertions, Applicants submit that the *McMahon* reference fails to teach or suggest anything regarding Applicant's currently claimed invention. More specifically, *McMahon* fails to teach or suggest at least two of the limitations included in each claim. First, *McMahon* fails to teach or suggest the placement of one of the light-emitting element or the light-receiving element facing the end face of the optical fiber, and the other placed adjacent an outer surface of the optical fiber and facing the reflecting surface. Second, *McMahon* fails to teach or suggest wherein the photoreceptor element is arranged outside a maximum diffusion range of the light

Appl. No. 10/765,752
Amdt. Dated September 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 28, 2005


emitted from said light-emitting element. Examiner, in the last Office Action, cites to Figure 4 "and its description" as teaching the second feature. However, Applicants respectfully refute that assertion. Applicants submit that the *McMahon* reference (including Figure 4 and Column 5, lines 14 – 54) fails to teach anything regarding the diffusion range of the light-emitting element.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the *McMahon* reference fails to teach or suggest anything regarding Applicants advance in the state of the art of optical transmitters/receivers. More specifically, *McMahon* fails to teach or suggest Applicant's novel optical fiber end-face structure providing for a separation of transmitted and received light without using any additional optical component.

Examiner's remaining references cited but not relied upon, considered either alone or in combination, also fail to teach applicant's currently claimed invention. In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/28/05


(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke
TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI,
BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.
105 W. Adams Street, 36th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Tel: (312) 704-1890
Attorney for Applicants


Annotated Sheet

ICAL COMMUNICATION MODULE AND CONNECTION
Inventor: Zenya NAGASHIMA
Docket No. 075834.00450

Robert J. Depke, Holland & Knight LLC - (312) 263-3600

1/8

Prior Art
FIG. 1



Prior Art
FIG. 2

